

REMARKS

The Examiner's final Office Action of 09/26/2005 has been reviewed.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 - 6 "under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jameson et al in view of Loker et al." Claims 2 - 6 are canceled herein. This rejection is traversed, insofar as it applies to Claim 1.

Jameson discloses a device that has a hose having a "conventional hydraulic female swivel 18, 19" ('023, Column 3, line 48 and 474, Column 3, line 14). There is no disclosure of the internal cross section of the pipe and its components. In essence, Jameson teaches a way to heat a hose and to keep the contents warm by applying an electrical device to the hose.

Loker teaches a hose coupling, or fitting, having an exterior bevel at the inward end. The function of the Loker outside bevel is to allow easy insertion of the fitting into a hose. "The hose receiving end 11 of the nipple 1 has a further inclined portion 25 to assist in the sliding of a hose 27 onto the hose receiving end and reduce the stresses on the hose" (Loker, Column 2, Lines 57 - 60).

The present invention, in Claim 1 as now amended, teaches a hose fitting that has a specifically claimed "inner surface having an internal radius beveled inlet to reduce the area of diminished flow within the hose." While Loker has a bevel on the

outside, its function is for allowing the easy insertion of the fitting into a hose. The present invention has a bevel in the inside, not the outside, so as to reduce the "area of diminished flow." Such a concept is important in the pharmaceutical industry, where heated materials pass through a hose. The "area of diminished flow" causes material to gather, and may be a source of contamination, if not properly cleaned.

The present device reduces such "area of diminished flow" by having a bevel so that linear movement through the hose fitting may be provided. It should be noted that the present invention does not teach or imply an external fitting bevel.

The present invention teaches away from that in the drawings by showing a straight outside surface of the fitting. See Figs. 2, 3, and 6.

Further, it is the present invention as claimed, the armor is the outermost coating of the tube, not within the tube as disclosed in the prior art. Note Claim 1, Paragraph 2.

While limited aspects of the present invention may be gleaned from the Loker and Jameson patents, neither teaches a fitting with an "inner surface having an internal radius beveled inlet" with the function "to reduce the area of diminished flow", as is specifically claimed in the present application. Note Claim 1, Paragraph 2. The only teaching regarding the decreasing

of the area of diminished flow by use of an internal bevel is in applicant's disclosure which, by definition, is not prior art.

It would appear that the Examiner has merely gleaned miscellaneous features in the prior art and has attempted to combine them without a teaching for their combination. The only teaching is in applicant's disclosure which, by definition, is not prior art. But even if there were a teaching for the combination, the resulting structure would still fail to anticipate applicant's invention for the reasons set forth herein above.

Applicant, therefore, submits that the amendments herein overcome all grounds of objection and rejection. Reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are requested.

If the Examiner is not of the opinion that this amendment places the application in condition for allowance, he is requested to enter the amendment for purposes of appeal.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward P. Dutkiewicz,
Reg. 46,676
640 Douglas Avenue
Dunedin, FL 34698
(727) 734-2855